Mr. Subbarama Chetty.—

Are there instances where candidates have been taken from communities which are already represented in the public service?

Second Member of Council.—

There may be.

Mr. Subbarama Chetty.—

If so, is it not against the order?

Second Member of Council.—

No.

Mr. Bandaiya.—

With reference to Appendix I, is there a community called Kunchitigar-Vokkaligar?

Third Member of Council —

For purposes of recruitment, Kunchitigas were regarded as a sub-caste under Vokkaligars. Now they are not so treated but are included under "Other Hindus."

Mr. Bhavikatte Channabasappa.—

Will the Government promise not to give room for such *galata* hereafter?

Third Member of Council.—

There is no *galata*.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

I. General Principles of the Bill to amend the Prevention of Adulteration Regulation.

In Section 2 of the Mysore Prevention of Adulteration Regulation, the term "local executive officer" is defined as follows:—

"In any Municipality, the President or Chairman of the Municipal Council and in other local areas, the President of the Taluk Board, or if there is no Taluk Board, the President of the District Board, or if there is no Taluk or District Board, such public servant as may be designated by Government, etc."

In view, however, of the creation of the appointment of Municipal Commissioner as the Chief Executive Officer and the abolition of Taluk Boards under the District Boards Regulation, 1925, the definition requires to be changed. It is proposed in this draft bill to provide for these changes.

Again, in Sections 12 (i) and 17 of the Regulation, it is not stated what class of Magistrates should try offences coming under the Regulation. With a view to strictly enforce the provisions of the Regulation, it is proposed that such cases should ordinarily be tried by First and Second Class Stipendiary Magistrates and by a Bench of Magistrates only when they are specially empowered in this behalf.

The above principles were approved by the House without discussion.

II. Statement of General principles of the Bill further to amend the Mysore Mines Regulation, 1906.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL explained the principles as follows:—

Under Section 17 of the Mysore Mines Regulation, 1906, the Superintendent of Police, Kolar Gold Fields, may by order in writing direct any person, whose residence within such area as may be notified by Government from time to time is considered undesirable, to quit the said area within 24 hours and such person cannot thereafter remain at or re-enter the said area without the permission of that officer. But the expression "undesirable" is not defined, the nature of the charge is not required to be intimated to the person concerned, no previous inquiry is prescribed and no limit is laid down as to the period during which an order passed under the Section may remain in force. A resolution moved in the Legislative Council in June 1925 brought prominently to notice the absence of these safeguards and in pursuance of the assurance then given by Government the question has been carefully considered and it is proposed to amend the Section so as to remedy the defects referred to above as far as possible. Briefly, the amendment in view is to define the classes of persons liable to be treated as undesirable for the purposes of this Section and to provide for an opportunity being given ordinarily to such persons to show cause before they are ordered to quit and for such orders having effect, in the case of subjects of His Highness the Maharaja paying kandayam, only for six months in the first instance.

It is proposed also to take this opportunity to amend Section 35 (2) of the Regulation so as to enable the Government to invest the Kolar Gold Fields Sanitary Board with the power to write off irrecoverable sums due on account of taxes, rates or cesses within the area under their management. This enabling provision is found necessary for the sake of administrative convenience.

MR. B. NARASINGA RAO thought that unless the definition of the word "undesirable" was placed before the House, it would not be convenient to discuss the principles.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL then read the following definition: "Persons whose residence will be deemed undesirable will include (i) All persons who have convictions (*a*) for theft or (*b*) for receiving mining material or (*c*) under Section 13 of this Regulation,

(ii) All persons against whom there is grave suspicion that they are stealing or receiving mining material or their associates,

(iii) Disorganisers of labour, and

(iv) Persons who have no ostensible means of subsistence and whose presence on the fields is considered dangerous or not safe in the interests of the Gold Mining Industry."

MR. B. NARASINGA RAO observed that the word "includes" might bring in many things and that it would not satisfy the House.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that any other definition might be suggested for consideration.

MESSRS. D. S. MALLAPPA and PUTTASAMI thought that the Government might themselves frame a proper definition and bring up the Bill once for all before the House in a complete form.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that the framing of the definition was a matter of detail and might be left for the Legislative Council to consider. He added that under the existing Regulation, the Superintendent of Police had unrestricted power and the object of the Bill was to restrict that power. If the Assembly agreed to that principle, the details of the legislation might be left to the Legislative Council for consideration.

MR. S VENKATESIAH thought that the word "theft" was not specific and wanted to know if the theft of mining materials alone was meant.

MR. VEMA REDDI was of opinion that the existing law being vague, the cases of harassment were few but that if

the law was defined as proposed, the Superintendent would know his powers clearly and would be enabled to proceed against a larger number of persons on the slightest suspicion, with the result that while many offenders escaped justice others really innocent would be subjected to harassment. The liberty of the person should be safeguarded by all means and the power of deporting people should not be allowed to be exercised without the approval of higher judicial authorities. He thought that it was dangerous to centre such arbitrary authority in a single individual. As an alternative he suggested that persistent offenders alone might be brought under the measure. He also suggested that the articles the theft of which is to bring a person under the definition should be specified, excluding articles of little or no value like scraps of iron, etc.

MR. B. L. BYANNA was of opinion that the intention to commit an offence should be the criterion and not any kind of technical offence. As an instance he said that if A loses an article and B finds it by accident on the road, the latter should not be punished.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that these were small details which the Courts of Law were quite competent to deal with.

MR. MAHOMED ABBAS KHAN said that the Bill was defective in certain particulars and that the following matters should also be included therein:—

(1) Appeal to the Chief Court should be provided against the orders of the District Magistrate.

(2) Notice "ordinarily" is provided but it should be given *always*, and in *every* case.

(3) It is provided that in the case of subjects of His Highness the Maharaja paying kandayam the order to quit should operate only for six months in the first instance. There might be many people who though not paying kandayam, might be merchants and that therefore the reference to the payment of "kandayam" might be omitted.

Mr. Mahomed Abbas Khan was of opinion that the enquiry should always be a judicial one, without which it would be quite unjust to deport a person arbitrarily, leaving his dependents to the tender mercies of circumstances.

In further explaining his position Mr. Mahomed Abbas Khan said that in the absence of a correct definition of the word "undesirable", it might happen that the theft of any insignificant material in the mining area such as candles, match boxes, etc., might be brought within the definition,

with the result that the Police Superintendent might take immediate action against a person for theft and deport him. This, he thought, would be unfortunate, for which reason, in addition to a clear definition of the term "theft", a judicial enquiry should be provided for. He also added that if the order of the Deputy Commissioner was in virtue of his being a District Magistrate, there would always be an appeal under the ordinary law and that it would not be difficult to specifically provide for such appeals in the Regulation itself.

All these things, he said, should be made clear in the Regulation before it could be properly considered by the House.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that it was not possible to provide for appeals against the orders of the Superintendent of Police and that in regard to the definition, any other suggestions that might be given by the members would be considered.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM IYENGAR also supported the contentions of Mr. Mahomed Abbas Khan and said that if the Police officer or the Magistrate acted arbitrarily, no remedy would be available to the people. He therefore thought that a judicial enquiry with record of evidence should be provided for in the Regulation itself.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that it was open to the District Magistrate to revise the order of the Police Superintendent.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM IYENGAR failed to understand how this could be done in the absence of any record of the evidence of witnesses examined before the Superintendent.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL pointed out that before an order of deportation was made the officer had to record reasons for the action he was going to take.

MR. BHASHYAM IYENGAR replied that such order was quite insufficient and as it involved the curtailment of the liberty of the subject of His Highness the Maharaja, particular care should be taken to see that such liberty was not affected. He was emphatically of opinion that the officer should indicate the nature of the grave suspicion against the person and why he was suspected, and that a decision on all these points based upon the evidence of witnesses should be recorded judicially and an appeal provided. Otherwise, he thought that the enquiry would only be a farce and nothing more.

MR. B. S. RANOJI RAO also supported the views of the previous speakers.

MR. S. VENKATESIAH thought that there was not much difference between the original Regulation and the amendment inasmuch as while under the Regulation a man could be deported without any hearing, the amendment provided only for a sort of personal conversation with the person proposed to be deported and nothing more. In his opinion it was necessary that the enquiry should be formal and judicial and that there should be proper safeguards in the interests of the liberty of a person.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA said that the Bill proposed to interfere with the personal liberty of a subject which was sacred to him and that such a matter should not be disposed of without the whole Bill being placed before the House.

MR. MAHOMED ABBAS KHAN conceded that the provisions of the original Regulation were very drastic. But he did not think that the Bill, in spite of its being a great improvement over the existing law, would be acceptable to the House unless the suggestions now made were adopted.

In winding up the debate THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that this part of the amendment would be further considered and brought up again at the next meeting of the Assembly and that the second part being unobjectionable, might be accepted.

The House approved of this proposal.

At this stage, the Assembly rose for lunch and re-assembled at 3-30 p.m.

III. Bill to amend the Mysore Income-tax Regulation.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL while explaining the principal features of the Bill to further amend the Mysore Income-tax Regulation, 1923, said that since the Mysore Regulation was last amended, certain changes had been effected in the British Indian Income-Tax Act and that the object of the measure under consideration was to bring the law generally into line with that in British India.

The following were the main changes proposed:—

(1) Allowing deduction as a business expenditure the difference between the original cost of the animals purchased for draught purposes and the amount realised by their disposal.

(2) Requiring the principal officer of every company to notify annually to the Income-Tax Department all the dividends paid to share-holders in excess of a sum to be prescribed by the rule, in order to ascertain accurately the income of assessees from this source.

(3) Prescribing procedure for assessment in the year following that in which partition is effected in a Hindu undivided family.

(4) Laying down the procedure for assessment in cases in which there is a change in the constitution of an assessee as for example, where a firm becomes company and also in cases where there is a change in the personnel of a firm ;

(5) Conferring on the Deputy Commissioner of Income-tax and the Commissioners the power to rectify mistakes in their appellate or review orders which they do not at present possess ;

(6) Making the law more definite in respect of the assessment of the profits, from import trade conducted in Mysore by agencies or branches, of non-resident assessees;

(7) Empowering Income-tax officers to impose a penalty of less than the maximum and to increase it successively up to a maximum in cases of continuing default ;

(8) Providing for deduction at source of super-tax payable on dividends due to non-resident share-holders.

(9) Empowering the framing of rules to find out the income, profits, etc., liable to tax of quasi-agricultural concerns such as tea companies; and

(10) Making a definite provision to the effect that the references in income-tax cases to the Chief Court should be heard by a Bench of not less than two Judges and where such judges disagree, the cases should be ordered to a Full Bench.

With reference to No. 6 MR. SUBBARAMA CHETTY stated that he failed to understand how the provision would work in practice. If a man traded to the extent of Rs. 10,000 in the State as a part of a big commercial concern, he thought that it was not quite possible to ascertain the profit he made only in Mysore.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the share attributable to business transacted in Mysore could be ascertained from accounts of or from other data according to the circumstances of each case..

MR. SUBBARAMA CHETTY still thought that while the agency might be taxed it would be difficult to tax the principal.

MR. C. NARASIMHIAH observed that while the company might get a profit in one place it might lose in another and that on the whole there might be a loss. In such cases it would be difficult to make an adequate assessment.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that when profits were made in the State, they should be subjected to tax.

With reference to point No. 3 MR. D. S. MALLAPPA enquired how the proposed amendment was going to be worked.

In reply THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL explained that the law treated a Hindu undivided family as a unit and after a partition was effected, it was proposed to tax each individual member in the next year according to his share of the property without, however, affecting the total liability of the joint family.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA then drew the attention of the Government to item No. 9 of the memorandum and said that his main fear was that while the agricultural income under the existing Regulation was exempt from the payment of income-tax it might, after the proposed amendment, be also brought under assessment. If the object of the Government was to bring tea and coffee alone under the purview of the amendment he had no objection, provided it was so stated definitely; otherwise he thought that the matter might be deferred for consideration after the full Bill was prepared and placed before the Assembly.

MR. B. KESAVIAH observed that the Government made a definite promise that agricultural income would not be assessed to income-tax and that if the Government proposed to bring tea lands under the purview of the Regulation he thought that it would be introducing the thin end of the wedge. He also feared that if tea and coffee were assessed to income-tax, it was just possible that Government would bring cocoanut cultivation and such other things also under the Regulation later. He thought that it would be inconvenient. He added that all articles produced out of land should be kept out of the Regulation.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that there was no question of taxing agricultural income which was free from tax under the law and the proposal was only to simplify the procedure for separating mixed incomes into agricultural and industrial, with a view to tax the latter.

MR. KESAVIAH explained that out of coffee that he grew on his lands he prepared parchment and several other kinds of coffee by various processes. He grew paddy from his lands and converted it by means of machinery into rice for sale. Merely because machinery was used for such conversion, agricultural produce could not be assessed to income-tax.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that the amendment did not propose to alter the existing law on the

subject and its sole object was to simplify the procedure to be followed in the case of incomes derived in part from agriculture and in part from business.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA also said that growers generally converted their produce into an easily saleable form by the use of machinery if necessary. If the conversion were to be considered as being effected by manufacturing processes, then he thought that it would be difficult to say that the profits from lands would not be taxed.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL pointed out that there was no question of modifying the principles of the existing income-tax law and what was suggested was only to prescribe rules to find out the income, profits, etc., liable to income-tax.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA observed that by the mere use of machinery no new industry was created and hence no income-tax should be levied.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that if the member meant that no tax should be levied on any income or profit from business in articles produced from lands, it would not be consistent with law.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA explained that what he meant was that the growers themselves who employed improved processes for selling their articles better should not be taxed.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL stated that that would mean that a grower of produce who made it the basis of a business should be exempt from paying the tax on the profits of such business while another who derived similar business profits from dealing in an agricultural product bought by him, should be taxed. This would be unfair and is not permissible under the law.

MR. MALLAPPA illustrated his point in another way. Sugar-cane could not be sold by itself at a large profit while if it was converted into jaggery such profits could be obtained. His contention was that the jaggery produced by the grower of sugar-cane should not be taxed.

Mr. Mallappa was not agreeable to copy the British Indian law in the present instance for various reasons.

THE MALNAD MEMBERS did not favour the idea of taxing tea also.

MR. NAGAPPA CHETTY observed that tea-growing was a process of cultivation and not of manufacture. Green tea leaves, for instance, would fetch no price at all unless they were worked by machinery. Simply because machinery was used, tea should not be taxed. Moreover the planters

were paying assessment on the tea gardens and if they were also subjected to income-tax in the way proposed they would be paying double assessment which should not be allowed.

THE COMMISSIONER OF INCOME-TAX explained that according to the existing law if in addition to agriculture there was also associated with it the employment of large machinery, the profits accruing from the latter would be assessable to income-tax. Whether a particular article was produced by the process of agriculture or of manufacture was a question of fact. If an article was produced by the use of agricultural implements alone, it was not subjected to income-tax but if the agricultural produce was obtained by means of machinery also, it might come under industry and be liable to income-tax.

MR. MALLAPPA asked in what category jaggery would fall.

THE COMMISSIONER OF INCOME-TAX replied that rulings on the point were different in different High Courts. He added that the income-tax officers should be guided by certain general considerations for which certain sets of rules were prescribed. They had to see whether the raiyats worked with machinery or not. If machinery was used it should be first inspected and tested before a definite decision was given as to liability to income-tax.

MR. B. S. LINGE GOWDA enquired whether by using rice-crushing machinery and thus saving some working expenses, they would be liable to tax.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that that was no conversion of the produce by the use of machinery.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMI enquired whether Sericulture would also come under the Income-tax Regulation.

Continuing, THE COMMISSIONER OF INCOME-TAX said that in the case of tea if the planters only picked tea there was no income-tax. But if they invested a lot of money in machinery. . . .

MR. NAGAPPA CHETTY said that the process for coffee and tea was the same and that without the use of machinery neither tea nor coffee could be prepared in a saleable form.

THE COMMISSIONER OF INCOME-TAX said if a large amount of money was invested on machinery for the purpose of converting the produce of lands into some other form, it would be taxed.

MR. B. NARASINGA RAO was of opinion that, if such a principle were introduced, it would have the effect of dis-

couraging the use of machinery for coffee and tea with the result that the industry would die out.

THE COMMISSIONER OF INCOME-TAX said that to bring a case under the Regulation there must be industrial and manufacturing processes for preserving agricultural produce for a long time and the operation must be of an industrial nature. For instance the machinery used to pick agricultural produce did not come under the Regulation. Mere use of machinery for agriculture did not constitute a ground for the levy of income-tax.

MR. NAGAPPA CHETTY enquired whether tea and coffee would be taxed.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that under the present law tea and coffee would be taxed. But what profits were made from agricultural operations and what from industrial operations ought to be determined and it was to prescribe the method of calculation that power to frame rules was sought in this Regulation.

MR. H. C. DASAPPA spoke in favour of the amendment. He explained that if no mention of tea companies had been made in the memorandum there would have been no discussion on the amendment as it did not propose to tax any industry or operation which was not already subjected to tax. He explained that the Government had full power to tax even the quasi-agricultural products even under the existing Regulation but the only point was how to find out the assessable profits. It was meant merely to prescribe the procedure and nothing more and whether jaggery should be taxed or not did not arise out of this amendment. In these circumstances he thought that there was no cause for any fear or alarm.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH said that by provision of the kind proposed there would be ample room for harassing the illiterate raiyats in the State who were not conversant with the methods of keeping accounts. As an example he said that if a raiyat grew mulberry and if he also kept certain domestic basins and made some money he might be taxed. The result would be that the sericultural industry itself would be discouraged. In these circumstances he prayed that the amendment should not be passed.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL again pointed out that the object of the amendment was not to tax any income or profits not already taxable under the existing law but only to prescribe the procedure for ascertaining the business part of mixed agricultural and business incomes or profits.

Further discussion at this stage was postponed.

IV. A Bill to amend the Government Savings Banks Act, 1873, as ni force in Mysore.

Whereas it is expedient further to amend the Government Savings Banks Act, 1873, as in force in Mysore; it is hereby enacted as follows:—

Amendment of Section 3.

1. In Section 3 of the Government Savings Banks Act, 1873, (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) for the definitions of "Secretary" and "Minor," the following shall be substituted, *viz.*:—

"Secretary" means, if the deposit is in a Taluk Treasury, the Amildar of the Taluk, and if it is in a District Treasury or the State Huzur Treasury, the Officer in immediate charge of such Treasury."

"Minor" means a person who has not completed the age of eighteen years or, if he is not domiciled in Mysore, has not attained majority according to the law to which he is subject."

Substitution of a new section for Section 4.

2. For Section 4 of the said Act, the following section shall be substituted, *viz.*:—

"4. If a depositor dies and probate of his will, or letters of administration of his estate, or a certificate granted under the Succession Certificate Regulation, 1901, is not, within three months of the death of the depositor, produced, then

(*a*) if the deposit does not exceed one hundred rupees, the Secretary may pay the same to any person appearing to him to be entitled to receive it, or to administer the estate of the deceased;

(*b*) if the deposit does not exceed three thousand rupees, the Deputy Commissioner of the District in which the deposit is made, and the Comptroller to the Government, when the deposit is made in the State Huzur Treasury, may pay the same to any person appearing to him to be entitled to receive it, or to administer the estate of the deceased."

Amendment of Sections 6 and 7.

3. In Sections 6 and 7 of the said Act, between the words "the Secretary of any such Bank" and the word "may," the following words shall be inserted, *viz.*:—

"The Deputy Commissioner of the District, or the Comptroller to the Government, as the case may be."

4. In Section 8 of the said Act, for the word "one" between the words "exceed" and "thousand," the word "three" shall be substituted and in proviso to the Section, between the words and comma "the Secretary of such Bank," and the word "and," the following words and commas shall be inserted, *viz.*:—

Amendment of Section 8.

"The Deputy Commissioner of the District, or the Comptroller to the Government, as the case may be,".

5. In Section 14 of the said Act, the words "by the Secretary of the Bank" shall be deleted.

Amendment of Section 14.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL explained the general principles of the measure as follows:—

The main object of the Bill is to facilitate withdrawal of small sums of money left in the Government Savings Bank accounts of deceased depositors. At present, a deposit not exceeding Rupees One Thousand (Rs. 1,000) may be paid without production of a probate of will, letters of administration, or a succession certificate. In the amendment, this limit is proposed to be raised to Rupees Three Thousand (Rs. 3,000), following the corresponding law in British India.

The Deputy Commissioners, in the case of deposits in Savings Banks in their districts, and, the Comptroller to the Government, in the case of deposits in the State Huzur Treasury, will be authorised to make payments up to the enhanced limit. With a view to provide for the prompt payment of small balances, it is also proposed to authorise the Officers in charge of Taluk, District, and State Huzur Treasuries to pay sums not exceeding Rupees One Hundred (Rs. 100) without production of probates of wills, letters of administration, or succession certificates.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM IYENGAR thought that if a depositor died and some man came forward and withdrew the amount, it would be disastrous to the wife and children of the deceased as they would have nothing left for their maintenance. Again he thought that a provision should be made for taking security from the person who received a succession certificate in a court of law. It should be provided that as soon as an application for succession certificate was filed in respect of money with the Government, immediate notice should be given to the Government.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that the existing

procedure was not going to be altered in any way. The object was merely to increase the limit from Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 3,000 and thus help the dependents of poor depositors, to get their money quickly. He added that a similar arrangement was in force in regard to deposit in the Post Office Savings Banks.

The House accepted the general principles of the Bill.

V. Statement of general principles in regard to amendment of the Mysore Lunacy Regulation.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL explained the general principles of the measure as follows:—

At the June Session of the Legislative Council of 1926 a resolution to the effect that the name 'Lunatic Asylum' be changed into 'Mental Hospital' was moved and was accepted by Government. This change involves an amendment of Clause I of Section 2 of the Mysore Lunacy Regulation.

The Senior Surgeon has proposed an amendment to Section 2 (2) of the Regulation, so that the definition of the term "cost of maintenance" may be made wide enough to include all charges that may be legitimately recovered under Sections 10 and 23 of the Regulation. This proposal is based of the amendment made to the corresponding Section of the Indian Lunacy Act.

It is proposed to provide for these two changes in the Amending Bill.

With reference to para 2 of the Statement, the Third Member explained that the definition of the term 'cost of maintenance' was now restricted to accommodation, feeding, clothing, medicine, nurses, etc., together with the charge for conveying lunatics to and from the Hospital. There might be, he said, other items not included in this definition such as cost of X-Ray photo, examination of blood or medical consultation. It was proposed to include such items also in the definition and hence the addition of the words "any other items."

MR. MD. ABBAS KHAN enquired from whom the cost would be collected.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that the existing law provided for recovering the cost from either the estate of the lunatic or his relative who is prepared to bear such expenses.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA was of opinion that such additional charges should be borne by Government.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL enquired whether it should be borne by Government themselves even in the case of rich people.

MR. MALLAPPA replied that an exception might be made, if necessary, in the case of rich people.. The fear was that if indefinite items were included in the cost of maintenance, such expenditure would be much more than could be met from the property of the lunatic.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL explained that unless the lunatic was possessed of an estate, or the person legally bound to maintain the lunatic had the means to maintain him, the cost of maintenance would not be recovered. If the man was able to pay, he did not see why all costs should not be recovered from him.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA said that it was the inability to pay the expenses that dissuaded people from admitting lunatics into the asylum. Even with such difficulties some lunatics were being brought to the asylum but if the expenses increased, there would be no hope of lunatics being brought to the asylum at all and there would be a chance of such lunatics being let loose in the streets. For these reasons, he was of opinion that no new expenses should be included in the cost of maintenance as already provided for.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL pointed out that the existing law provided exemption from payment in the case of persons who were not able to pay. Such a law as was proposed in the amendment was also in force in British India.

MR. H. C. DASAPPA was of opinion that the analogy of British India would not apply to Mysore: for, in British India, Government hospitals were few and lunatics had to be provided in private hospitals with the liability to pay the cost of maintaining them. In this State there was only one hospital where X-Ray photographs were taken and blood examined and as this was also a Government hospital, there was no reason why services to lunatics should be charged for. While the British Indian Hospitals had to pay for such services rendered in private hospitals, in Mysore there was no private agency to whom Government was called upon to pay for the like services. He therefore thought that there was no necessity for including 'other expenses.'

MESSRS. B. NARASINGA RAO and B. L. BYANNA were of opinion that it was a very small matter and that it need not be seriously pressed by Government.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL explained that the Mysore Asylum contained a considerable number of inmates from the Civil and Military Station, and that there was no reason why even they should not pay for the cost of their maintenance.

THE DEWAN, however, said that the matter would be dropped for the present.

The remaining part of the measure was agreed to by the House.

At this stage, the House adjourned to meet again the next day.